United Nations E/AC.51/2013/L.4/Add.2

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
20 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-third session
3-28 June 2013
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Ms. Hélène **Petit** (France)

Addendum

Report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit

(*Item 5*)

Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system

1. At its fifth meeting, on 5 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) entitled "Financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system" (A/67/867), as well as the comments thereon of the Secretary-General and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) (A/67/867/Add.1).

2. Inspector Tadanori Inomata introduced the JIU report and responded to queries raised during its consideration by the Committee. A representative of the CEB secretariat introduced the report containing the comments of the Secretary-General and CEB.

Discussion

3. A number of delegations generally supported the findings and recommendations of the report. In particular, delegations expressed appreciation with the richness of the information and excellent analyses provided as well as the concise summary of actions proposed for Member States and executive heads of organizations concerned.

4. Several delegations expressed satisfaction at having JIU reports before the Committee for review following the absence of such reports over the past years,

Please recycle

which weakened the coordinating role of the Committee as mandated by the General Assembly.

5. Many delegations stressed the role of the Committee in system-wide coordination among programmes of the United Nations system organizations. In addition, views were expressed that the report of JIU coincided with the aim of the Organization to provide a global governance framework on humanitarian operations in the system and had provided the Committee with a timely opportunity to strengthen its function with respect to humanitarian operations. Some delegations were of the view that the report should also be considered by the Economic and Social Council at its humanitarian segment and by the Second and Third committees of the General Assembly.

6. Clarification was sought by some delegations as to the scope of the report in relation to past reports prepared by JIU addressing similar subjects. A number of delegations queried where they could find information on the effect of previous recommendations in JIU reports in this domain, where the United Nations system organizations stood and how past recommendations could be compared with those that had been put forward this time. Views were expressed regarding guidance needed to understand the degree of success of past recommendations in relation to the current ones. Delegations expressed positive comments regarding the web-based follow-up system of recommendations made by JIU.

7. Some delegations sought clarification regarding the methodology used to carry out the review, for example, the extent to which on-the-spot interviews and ad hoc inquiries had been carried out and the use of questionnaires. The delegations noted the wide scope of the review, aimed at identifying in a comprehensive way the numerous funding mechanisms of humanitarian operations within the United Nations system. A delegation further noted according to paragraph 8 of the report that the methodology applied for collecting data on the subject under review had included, inter alia, travel by the Inspector himself to several locations in different geographical areas. The delegation was of the view that the collection of data and conduct of interviews should take place through the most economical means of communication.

8. Several delegations expressed views and sought clarification regarding the predictability and the assured basis of funding, including the use of regular and core resources versus extrabudgetary and earmarked contributions. A number of delegations queried why the CEB organizations were keen on the role of cash and in-kind contributions from the private sector and individuals during major humanitarian crises.

9. Some delegations underlined the civilian character of humanitarian assistance, while noting the possibility that military assets might be used in humanitarian operations. The delegations also explored an approach that would develop separate analyses and different governance frameworks for the delivery of assistance to respond to natural disasters and complex emergencies.

10. Many delegations stressed the need for smooth transition financing through the stages of emergency, early recovery, recovery through reconstruction and strengthening of resilience to disasters. Views were expressed that the dichotomy between humanitarian assistance and development aid, including early recovery activities, should be overcome. Some delegations held the view that humanitarian

financing was not confined to developing countries, referring to the recent nuclear and natural disasters in Japan and to other natural disasters in Central Europe. A few delegations were concerned about the possible impact of the growth in humanitarian assistance on the overall availability of official development assistance. Many delegations expressed interest in identifying a means to better combine development aid with humanitarian assistance in a proper way so as not to duplicate the use of both resources, and reflected on the feasibility of drawing on lessons of experience from the integrated strategic plans and frameworks of the United Nations integrated missions as well as the Common Humanitarian Action Plans and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework processes of the United Nations country teams.

11. A number of delegations expressed appreciation in principle for the general thrust of the recommendations presented in the report, in particular recommendations 2, 6 and 8 aimed at facilitating the financing of humanitarian operations in the field, and noted the intention of JIU to present them to the agencies dealing with humanitarian assistance. A number of delegations expressed interest in developing, as reflected in recommendation 6 of the report, a system-wide policy for the United Nations organizations to provide capacity-building assistance for national insurance schemes with the necessary synergy among them. With regard to recommendation 8, some delegations expressed the preference that better use be made of existing processes and warned against establishing another bureaucratic process.

Conclusions and recommendations

12. **The Committee took note of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on financing for humanitarian operations in the United Nations system (A/67/867) and recommended that the General Assembly endorse the recommendations contained in the report.**

13. **The Committee further recommended that, while endorsing recommendation 1, the General Assembly request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chair of CEB, to replace the phrase "disaster-prone countries and countries in fragile situations" with the phrase "countries emerging from conflicts or recovering from natural disasters".**

14. **The Committee noted the wide scope of the review, which aimed to identify in a comprehensive manner the funding mechanisms for humanitarian operations within the United Nations system, and the Committee appreciated the general thrust of the recommendations presented in the report of JIU aimed at providing a strategic planning framework for financing humanitarian operations.**

15. **The Committee further noted that in the process of collecting data, the most effective and efficient methodology should be applied.**

16. **The Committee recommended that JIU continue to monitor the implementation of its recommendations as approved by the relevant intergovernmental bodies in order to ensure the effectiveness of humanitarian action.**